DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 659 RC 000 825

By- Woods, Richard G.; Harkins, Arthur M.
INDIAN EMPLOYMENT IN MINNEAPOLIS.
Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Training Center for Community Programs.
Pub Date Apr 68
Note- 96p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.92
Descriptors- *AMERICAN INDIANS, ATTITUDES, COMMUNITY AGENCIES (PUBLIC), EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, EDUCATIONAL STATUS COMPARISON, EMPLOYER ATTITUDES, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, *EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, *JOB APPLICANTS, *MIGRATION PATTERNS, POPULATION DISTRIBUTION, POPULATION TRENDS, RURAL POPULATION, *STATISTICAL DATA, URBAN AREAS, URBAN POPULATION
Identifiers- American Indian Employment Center, Chippewa Indians, Duluth, *Minneapolis, Minnesota, St. Paul

Employment problems, and the related personal and social difficulties encountered by Indian Americans in the Twin Cities metropolitan area of Minnesota are discussed. Topics include: rural-urban and intra-city population movements; Indian employment agency experiences; a survey of employment center application files; factors associated with educational attainment; Indian resident surveys in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth; attitudes of employment personnel and other agency personnel toward Indians; and employment problems and city adaptation. It is recommended that an effective Indian center be established with structured agency services and assistance, thereby making it possible to undertake special demonstration and research programs. The appendix contains pertinent statistical data and questionnaires utilized in structured interviews. A bibliography concludes the document. (SW)

RECEIVED
29 1968
L.A.I.C.

TRAINING CENTER for Community Programs

INDIAN EMPLOYMENT IN MINNEAPOLIS

University of Minnesota

RC000 825
ED021659

INDIAN EMPLOYMENT

IN

MINNEAPOLIS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INDIAN EMPLOYMENT IN MINNEAPOLIS

by
Richard G. Woods
and
Arthur M. Harkins

Training Center for
Community Programs

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

April, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Rural-Urban and Intra-City Population Movements	1
III.	Indian Employment Agency Experiences	4
IV.	Survey of Employment Center Applications File	7
V.	Factors Associated with Educational Attainment	14
VI.	Inner City Populations - Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth	18
VII.	Attitudes of Employment and Other Agency Personnel Toward Indians	23
VIII.	Conclusions	35
IX.	Recommendations	39
	Appendix (Data)	
	Appendix (Questionnaires)	
	Bibliography	

The research reported here was carried out in an attempt to better understand the problems of Indian Americans in adapting to the ways of the city. This report is brief, and only lightly touches upon the highlights of data available from a series of recent surveys conducted under the technical direction of the Training Center for Community Programs at the University of Minnesota. Our thanks go to all who participated in the collection of the data, and to Dorothy Speidel of the Minneapolis League of Women Voters, Barbara Johnson of Macalester College, Thomas Walz and his class of senior social work students at the University of Minnesota, and Eugene Peacock of Duluth, Minnesota.

I. Introduction.

Indian Americans have migrated heavily to the Twin Cities metropolitan area of Minnesota in the past two decades.

For many Indian adults, part of the complex of personal and social difficulties accompanying this change of residency pattern is the difficulty of securing and retaining adequate employment in the urban setting.

This report deals with Indian employment problems and what appear to be related factors. It is concerned both with Indian people and with largely non-Indian inner city agency people who work regularly with Indian clientele.

The report claims no final answers or questions, but indicates at best the usefulness of quantifiable data on Indian employment and the need for much more of these data. Documentation of this kind is a virtual necessity for imaginative planning and execution of programs related to a persistent problem of Indian people: making provision for self and family in an unfamiliar world of work and work values.

II. Rural-Urban and Intra-City Population Movements.

At the moment, little is being done to develop and support a series of urban - reservation located centers leading to the provision of relevant and meaningful services for Minnesota Indian people involved in a complicated two-way population flow, and to

further the understanding of Indian migrant patterns themselves through related research work.

Data from the Minneapolis American Indian Employment Center and other sources suggest that there is a substantial core of Indian migrants who enter and leave the Minneapolis - St. Paul area each year in response to social and economic pushes and pulls. The exact nature of these migratory paths and the relative strengths of various influencing factors are not known, yet the effects of migration may be expected to alter the educational, social and economic lives of many Indian Americans in this region. Similarly, the high movement frequency of Indians within urban centers affects employment-related factors.

Not all Indians display this propensity to migrate. Data from house-to-house surveys in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, to be reviewed in more detail later, suggest that there is another, more stable urban Indian population which is less likely to change its residence. The difference is strong enough to suggest that the two populations are quite distinct. Table 1 illustrates the relative permanence and impermanence of the populations.

Table 1. TIME IN CITY

Males and Females Combined
(Figures are percentages)

	(743) AIEC Applicants	(100) Minneapolis Residents	(48) St. Paul Residents	(200) Duluth Residents
NA	4.2	2.0	0	2.5
Less than one year	51.1	6.0	14.7	14.0
One year and more	44.7	92.0	85.3	83.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Before meaningful employment and other programs can be designed to meet the needs of Indian Americans, much more must be known about the systems of migratory patterns. The provision of education for Indian children, the employability potentials of Indian adults, the eligibility of Indians for health and welfare services, and the extent to which Indians can expect to become a part of a predominantly white society depend in large part upon these cultural habits of mobility. From existing data it is evident that substantial numbers of Indian migrants to Minneapolis come from or return to White Earth, Mille Lacs, Red Lake and Leech Lake reservations. They come to Duluth from Fond du Lac and to St. Paul from Wisconsin reservations. It is also evident that a substantial minority of migrant Indians do not display the same degree of attachment to Indian reservations. What is not clear is the scope and frequency of urban-reservation, reservation-urban, inter- and

intra-city movements, as well as the factors which induce Indians to assume relatively permanent households in urban or rural settings. A systems approach to these questions could have substantial meaning for greater understanding of employment problems and related factors.

III. Indian Employment Agency Experiences

Two reports about the American Indian Employment Center are currently available: a report prepared by the Edward F. Waite Neighborhood House covering the period from March 1965 to January 1966, and a report by the American Indian Employment Center itself, detailing experience from November 1966 to April 1967. From these reports, several indications about the employment problems of some urban Indian Americans can be specified:

1. Indians made extensive use of the services of employment agencies specialized by ethnicity.
2. Those Indians placed probably would have been considered "unemployable" by the usual employment agency, and so would not have received adequate services.
3. Employers, although in general sympathetic and interested, tended to have disappointing experiences with attempts to employ Indians.
4. The clientele of the agency were perceived by agency workers to be different from the Indians who had adjusted to the urban community.
5. The typical client was unskilled, and this meant that

he had few opportunities..

6. A familiar employment pattern for the clients of the agency was the habit of leaving a job shortly after having started it, for reasons which would have appeared insignificant to many white Americans (for example, returning to the reservation because of family ties, transportation difficulties, etc.).

7. For many reasons, Indians tended not to have developed specific job goals.

8. The typical employment history of the Center's clients was unstable, so that it was very difficult for them to gain employment.

9. Indians seemed to be uncomfortable in a situation where they were employed by a predominantly white organization. Difficulties in relating to non-Indians also seemed to make Indians uncomfortable.

10. The typical Indian served by the Center seemed to have great difficulty in communicating with the employer. In the words of one report, "He doesn't understand exactly what he is supposed to do, when he is supposed to come to work, and what he is not supposed to do."

11. Mobility within the city was so great for the Center's clients that it was very difficult to place them. In one follow-up study in September of 1965, only 30 out of 315 applicants (9½%) could be located at their previous addresses and telephone numbers. Such a

mobility pattern made follow-up activities for clients extremely difficult to establish.

12. Many traditional employment practices were difficult for Indians to understand and accept. Application blanks, interviews, tests, pay procedures, and the like were often strange and discomfiting procedures to the Indian.

13. Indian clients evidence considerable distrust for the non-Indian and this distrust caused difficulty for both of them.

14. The Indian client tended to be very sensitive to criticism and ridicule, and this was compounded by his general feelings of discomfort in the employment situation.

15. Although experience was limited, it appeared to be possible that Indians could achieve satisfactory job adjustment when placed into a predominately Indian job environment.

16. Special problems of the Center's clients which had a bearing upon employability included lack of a telephone; unfamiliarity with the city and transportation difficulties; and lack of sufficient money to pay for initial expenses related to employment, such as carfare, uniforms, union dues, and tools.

17. It appeared to be very difficult to achieve long-term employment with this population. For example, the six-month Center report for November, 1966 to April, 1967 indicated that only 55 of 527 applicants (10.4%) were hired during that period who were still employed when the report was submitted.

If these indications, in general, hold for the kind of population which specialized or regular employment centers will likely serve in the future, problems of employability development for these clients are quite vast.

IV. Survey of Employment Center Applications Files

Late during the summer of 1967, the Training Center for Community Programs sent a coder to the American Indian Employment Center to transcribe raw data from the Employment Center's files onto code sheets. After keypunching, simple machine analysis of the information was made. From the analysis of data which followed, it is possible to briefly sketch the characteristics of the "typical" applicant or client of the Employment Center.[1]

Males: (N-551)

The typical Indian American male served by the American Indian Employment Center:

Had a telephone	47.7%
Did not have a car	72.8%

---

[1] For more complete data, see the tables in Section I of the Appendix.

Was in the age range 16 - 22	38.8%	
or was in the age range 23 - 40	47.7%	86.5%
Was single		55.9%
Reported no physical defects		50.2%
Was not a veteran		58.1%
Had ¼ to ½ Indian blood	33.0%	
or had ½ to full Indian blood	55.0%	88.0%
Was Chippewa		82.2%
Came to Minneapolis from -		
White Earth Reservation	21.8%	
Red Lake Reservation	21.8%	
Leech Lake Reservation	14.9%	
or "Other" (specific towns)	22.9%	81.4%
Was born at -		
White Earth Reservation	16.5%	
Red Lake Reservation	20.3%	
or "Other" (specific towns)	51.7%	88.5%
Reported receiving no aid from the BIA		71.1%
Received relocation assistance, if he did report receiving BIA aid		15.2%
Had lived in the Twin Cities less than one year		52.5%
Had lived at his present address less than one year		72.4%

Did not know or did not answer when asked the cost of his rent and utilities — 54.1%

If he did report the cost of his rent and utilities, it was between $50 and $99 per month — 29.4%

Reported having no debts — 66.4%

Was not receiving welfare assistance — 83.8%

Was not a union member — 84.9%

Was not a high school graduate — 75.7%

Had no special skills or training — 52.3%

Expressed an interest in further education and training — 55.9%

Reported as work interests -

"Anything" — 31.2%

General Factory, Warehouse, or Labor — 26.5%

57.7%

Reported that he does not harvest wild rice — 47.7%

Was given one referral — 56.6%

Was referred to a commercial store or plant — 58.4%

Females: (N-192)

The typical Indian American female served by the American Indian Employment Center:

Had a telephone — 54.5%

Did not have a car — 83.3%

Was in the age range 16 - 22	55.7%	
or was in the age range 23 - 40	33.9%	
		89.6%
Was single		57.8%
Reported no physical defects		94.3%
Was not a veteran		80.7%
Had ¼ to ½ Indian blood	24.5%	
or had ½ to full Indian blood	57.3%	
		81.8%
Was Chippewa		83.9%
Came to Minneapolis from -		
White Earth Reservation	24.0%	
Red Lake Reservation	22.9%	
Leech Lake Reservation	16.7%	
Or "Other" (specific towns)	10.9%	
		74.5%
Was born at -		
White Earth Reservation	15.1%	
Red Lake Reservation	21.9%	
Or "Other" (specific towns)	52.1%	
		89.1%
Reported receiving no aid from the BIA		79.7%
Received other than relocation assistance, if she did report receiving BIA aid		8.9%
Had lived in the Twin Cities less than one year		47.5%

Had lived at her present address less than one year		75.0%
Did not know or did not answer when asked the cost of her rent and utilities		44.8%
If she did report the cost of her rent and utilities, it was between $50 and $99 per month		38.0%
Reported having no debts		64.6%
Was not receiving welfare assistance		76.0%
Was not a union member		82.8%
Was not a high school graduate		75.1%
Had no special skills or training		58.3%
Expressed an interest in further education and training		58.3%
Reported as work interests -		
"Anything"	15.1%	
General Factory, Warehouse, and Labor	39.6%	
Clerical and Office Work	10.9%	
Household Domestic and Hospital Work	14.1%	
		79.7%
Reported that she does not harvest wild rice		57.3%
Was given one referral		55.7%
Was referred to a commercial store or plant	30.4%	59.4%

From these data a "typical" American Indian Employment Center applicant may be pictured. He was a young or middle-aged

single male who reported having no physical defects, and was not a military service veteran. He was from $\frac{1}{4}$ to full-blooded Chippewa who was born at White Earth Reservation, Red Lake Reservation or some specific town, and who came to Minneapolis from White Earth Reservation, Red Lake Reservation, Leech Lake Reservation, or some specific town. He did not have a car, which probably necessitated using the public transportation system. He had a telephone, but had lived in the Twin Cities less than one year and at his present address less than one year. He tended to give no answer when asked the cost of his rent and utilities, but if he did answer, he reported the cost at between $50 and $99 per month. He tended to report receiving no aid from the BIA, but if he did report receiving aid, it was relocation assistance. He said that he had no debts and that he was not receiving welfare assistance. He was not a high school graduate, had no special skills or training, but expressed an interest in further education and training. He was not a union member, and his work interests were "anything", general factory, warehouse, or labor, or a specific occupation. He reported that he does not harvest wild rice. He was given one referral by the Employment Center, and that referral was to a commercial store or plant.

These data in general confirm the picture revealed by earlier reports about the clientele of the American Indian Employment Center. What are the employment implications for such a population?

1. The young, single male so characteristic of the American Indian Employment Center clientele is likely to be perceived by potential employers as unstable, particularly if his employment history is sporadic, as his mobility habits might suggest.

2. The typical applicant at the American Indian Employment Center had inadequate educational credentials, had no special skills or training, and evidenced little in the way of upward occupational striving. From the employer's point of view, this would represent at least questionable motivation for work. The lack of employment credentials suggests that the kinds of work these applicants are likely to obtain would be unskilled or semi-skilled, unless they could participate in some sort of employment "feeder" program, providing employability training and perhaps skills development training.

3. It is unlikely that most of these applicants receive supporting benefits and services which might make their successful employment more likely. Because of their mobility, they may not be able to meet the residence requirements for welfare payments. They tend not to be military veterans, so they would not be eligible for veteran's benefits and services. They are not union members, so the protections and benefits of organized labor are not available to them.

4. The lack of a car poses transportation problems insofar as employment is concerned. Ability to use public transportation could, therefore, be critical to success in employment.

5. The short period of time spent in the Twin Cities, together with indications of considerable reservation - urban mobility suggests a need for extensive relocation assistance and intensive orientation to city life and to work. This orientation could begin before migration occurs.

V. Factors Associated with Educational Attainment.

Considering the American Indian Employment Center applicants, what difference does the possession of a high-school certificate make? Tables V (1), V (2), and V (3) in the Appendix contrast non-high school graduates (NHSG) with high school graduates (HSG). Perhaps noting the limited differences which do exist is the most significant observation that can be made from these comparisons. Except for some slight differences, high school graduates resemble non-high school graduates to a remarkable extent.

Despite the overall impression of similarity, a larger proportion of the male HSGs reported having a telephone than was the case with male NHSGs. Another difference between the two male groups occurred in the case of marital status: male HSGs were more likely to be married than their NHSG counterparts. Male HSGs were more likely to be military service veterans than were male

NHSGs, but there was no difference between the two groups in terms of special skills acquired through military service. For this population, military service does not seem to be a productive source of training for civilian life.

Interestingly, in the case of tribal affiliation, while the proportion of male HSGs who were Chippewa was slightly less than the proportion of male NHSGs who were Chippewa, the percent of male HSGs who were Sioux was almost three times the proportion of male NHSGs who were Sioux. (The total number of male Sioux was a relatively small part of the total population.) Male HSGs were much more likely to report having received assistance from the BIA than were male NHSGs, and they were more likely to have received assistance other than relocation aid. Nett Lake Reservation contributed a larger proportion of male HSGs than male NHSGs, while White Earth Reservation accounted for a smaller proportion of male HSGs than male NHSGs. An example of the similarity between the two educational groups is afforded by the time reported in the Twin Cities and the length of time at present address:

MALES

Table 2
TIME IN TWIN CITIES

	NHSG	HSG
NA	3.5%	7.5%
Less than one year	52.5	52.5
One year and more	44.1	40.1
	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3
LENGTH OF TIME AT PRESENT ADDRESS

	NHSG	HSG
NA	10.0%	8.3%
Less than one year	70.3	70.8
One year and more	19.7	20.8
	100.0%	100.0%

Male HSGs were less likely to give no answer to the question about the cost of rent and utilities than were male NHSGs and, on the average, they reported a slightly higher monthly cost for rent and utilities. Male HSGs were more likely to report debts than were male NHSGs. Male HSGs were decidedly more likely to report having received on-the-job training than their NHSG counterparts, but the two groups were equally likely to display an interest in further education and training. No differences could be detected between the two groups in terms of type of work interests, but male HSGs were more likely to report that they did not harvest wild rice than were male NHSGs. A very small proportion of the total male population was referred to agencies other than the commercial store or plant, but a larger proportion of male HSGs were referred to OEO programs such an New Careers, while no HSGs were referred to Job Corps and NYC as contrasted with 3.7% of the NHSGs.

Female HSGs were more likely to report having a telephone and a car than were female NHSGs. A higher proportion of female HSGs came from Leech Lake Reservation than was the case with female NHSGs. Also, 20% of female HSGs were born at White Earth Reservation, contrasted with 14.1% of female NHSGs. 37.5% of female HSGs reported receiving assistance from the BIA compared with 12.1% of female NHSGs. Female HSGs were relatively more likely to report receiving BIA assistance other than relocation aid (22.5%) than were female NHSGs (5.4%). Although the two female groups were quite similar in terms of the amount of time they had spent in the Twin Cities, the female

HSGs were relatively more likely to have lived for a longer period of time at their present address than were the female NHSGs.

FEMALES

Table 4
TIME IN TWIN CITIES

	NHSG	HSG
NA	2.7%	5.0%
Less than one year	49.0	42.5
One year and more	48.3	52.5
	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5
LENGTH OF TIME AT PRESENT ADDRESS

	NHSG	HSG
NA	2.7%	2.5%
Less than one year	77.8	70.0
One year and more	19.4	27.5
	99.9%	100.0%

Twice the proportion of female HSGs reported that they had debts (30.0%) than was the case with female NHSGs (14.1%). 15.0% of the female HSGs said they were presently receiving welfare assistance, as contrasted with only 9.4% of the female NHSGs. No females were union members. Female HSGs reported more frequently that they had acquired special skills in the military service (10.0%) and through on-the-job training (32.5%); military-acquired skills were reported by 2.0% of female NHSGs, while 21.5% of that group reported acquiring skills through on-the-job training. A larger proportion of female HSGs reported interests in white-collar employment (22.5%) than was the case with female NHSGs (7.4%). Female HSGs were somewhat more likely to report that they harvest wild rice (30.0%) than were female NHSGs (20.1%). Finally, female HSGs were more likely to have had two referrals from the Employment Center (25.0%) than

were the female NHSGs (15.4%).

In sum, while the beneficial effects of more education were evident to a slight degree, the differences between high school graduates and those who had not graduated from high school appeared to be minor according to these data.

VI. Inner City Indian Populations -- Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth.

Earlier in this report, it was noted that agency workers in the American Indian Employment Center perceived their clientele as being different from the Indians who have adjusted to the urban community. Do such differences really exist and, if so, what is their nature?

Data concerning Indian populations are available from house-to-house surveys in the inner cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth. The Minneapolis data came from a class project conducted by social work undergraduates at the University of Minnesota; the St. Paul survey was conducted by a student seeking material for a term paper, and the Duluth Indian Resident Survey was conducted by Mr. Eugene Peacock of the Central Neighborhood Community Center of Duluth. The first two data collection projects were directed by Arthur Harkins.

Seven variables are common to these three Indian resident surveys and the American Indian Employment Center data, so that it is possible to compare the four populations on seven dimensions. Utilizing a common coding scheme, the following tables were constructed:

Tables 6 - 12	(N)	MALES AND FEMALES COMBINED AIEC Applicants (743)	Minneapolis Residents (100)	St. Paul Residents (48)	Duluth Residents (200)
6. Sex					
No Answer		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Male		74.2	31.0	18.8	73.5
Female		25.8	69.0	81.2	26.5
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7. Telephone					
No Answer		23.4%	1.0%	0.0%	14.5%
Yes		49.4	60.0	70.8	50.0
No		27.2	39.0	29.2	35.5
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
8. Age					
No Answer		.7%	1.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Up to and including 15		.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
16 - 22		43.2	15.0	14.6	2.0
23 - 40		44.1	56.0	41.7	39.5
41 - 64		11.2	24.0	37.5	47.0
65 and above		0.0	4.0	6.2	10.0
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
9. Marital Status					
No Answer		2.4%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Single		56.4	14.0	16.7	14.5
Married		29.6	62.0	60.4	53.5
Separated		7.5	9.0	8.3	11.0
Divorced		3.0	7.0	10.4	12.0
Widowed		1.1	7.0	4.2	8.0
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		AIEC Applicants (N) (743)	Minneapolis Residents (100)	St. Paul Residents (48)	Duluth Residents (200)
10.	Reservation of Birth				
	White Earth	16.2%	27.0%	16.7%	7.5%
	Mille Lacs	3.1	1.0	0.0	1.0
	Fond du Lac	0.0	2.0	0.0	28.0
	Red Lake	20.7	16.0	8.3	6.5
	Leech Lake	.5	6.0	8.3	4.5
	Nett Lake	1.3	1.0	4.2	7.5
	Grand Portage	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
	Wisconsin and Dakotas	6.4	11.0	4.2	12.5
	Other (towns named)	51.8	36.0	58.3	25.0
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
11.	Education				
	No Answer	2.6%	5.0%	0.0%	2.5%
	0 - 5 years	1.3	4.0	0.0	6.5
	6 - 8 years	17.5	11.0	14.6	33.5
	9 years	14.5	9.0	16.7	14.0
	10 years	22.1	16.0	12.5	17.0
	11 years	20.1	12.0	12.5	6.0
	12 years	19.4	35.0	22.9	19.0
	13 years or above	2.6	8.0	20.8	0.0
	College Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	AIEC Applicants (743)	Minneapolis Residents (100)	St. Paul Residents (48)	Duluth Residents (200)
12. Time in City				
No Answer	4.2%	2.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Less than 30 days	30.8	1.0	0.0	7.0
1 - 3 months	8.9	1.0	4.2	3.5
4 - 6 months	6.2	3.0	6.3	2.5
7 - 11 months	5.2	1.0	4.2	1.0
1 - 2 years	10.1	13.0	6.3	8.5
3 - 5 years	9.3	23.0	12.5	9.0
6 - 9 years	6.6	14.0	16.7	10.5
10 years and above	18.7	42.0	50.0	55.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

These tables should be read with caution, because of complications introduced by different methodological situations inherent in each project, and because of problems raised in the use of a lone male interviewer in Duluth and a lone female interviewer in St. Paul, to name only two. However, the tables do make possible at least these few generalizations: Center applicants are a young, single, male, non-high school graduate population which is new to the city and not very likely to have a telephone (and, by implication, perhaps not likely to have a permanent residence). These data tend to confirm the impression that the Employment Center applicants are different from Indians who have, relatively, adjusted to the urban community.

Some further observations relevant to this population may be

made:

1. Those who lack telephones and cars can be expected to have some difficulty getting to work or to a job interview. While it has been specified already that there might be a need for employability training, there is also the need for outreach workers to make initial contacts and follow-up on applicants who cannot be reached any other way.
2. 7.4% of NHSGs and 6.7% of HSGs reported physical defects, signalling the need for some medical services. The fact that 61.9% of male NHSGs and 44.2% of male HSGs reported that they were not military service veterans may be a further indication that they could not pass physical and/or mental tests and thus may be in need of therapy.
3. For most applicants, the number of referrals is <u>one</u>. More needs to be known about this. Does this mean that they do not return after one referral, or does it mean that they become successfully employed given only one referral?
4. Almost 56% of both NHSGs and HSGs reported an interest in further education and training. An Indian employment agency may need to institute some kinds of training and/or education, and it probably needs to be aware of community educational and training facilities in order to be able to refer. Given the cultural obstacles, it might be better to structure classes for Indians only.
5. Referrals to agencies other than commercial stores or

plants are few in number. This suggests, given the characteristics of the applicant population, that community resources need to be better utilized.

VII. Attitudes of Employment and Other Agency Personnel Toward Indians.

Personnel in six types of Minneapolis agencies were asked for their impressions of Indian adults and youth living in the Twin Cities. Their ratings were obtained by using a "semantic differential" questionnaire employing twenty-six paired adjectives. A scoring system indicated the strength and direction of responses for each pair of adjectives. The types of agencies surveyed and the number of respondents who mailed a useable questionnaire are as follows:

Agency Type	Number of Respondents
Employment	43
Health	32
Miscellaneous (Park, Library, United Fund)	88
Education	133
Welfare	170
Law and Corrections	230
	696

The scales provided to measure the responses to the paired adjectives provided seven positions for rating between the two words. An example, not included among the twenty-six pairs:

Good : : : : : : : Bad

Response percentages for each of the seven positions for each pair of adjectives were computed, then the middle (or fourth) position was discarded. Percentages for the three positions adjacent to each adjective were totaled, and the smaller total percentage was subtracted from the larger total percentage. The resulting balance (or loading) was categorized into one of the following classes for interpretive purposes: 0 - 10%, not significant; 10 - 20%, slightly significant; 20 - 40%, significant; 40%, very significant.

The pairs of adjectives used were:

trustworthy - untrustworthy	wise - unwise
neat - messy	unfriendly - friendly
reliable - unreliable	sincere - insincere
happy - sad	kind - cruel
interested - bored	polite - impolite
honest - dishonest	cowardly - brave
active - passive	dependable - undependable
hard working - lazy	sociable - unsociable
stupid - intelligent	rude - courteous
religious - irreligious	likeable - unlikeable
traditionalistic - modern	knowledgeable - ignorant
ambitious - unambitious	peace-loving - belligerent
emotional - rational	talkative - quiet

Responses from all agencies may be tabularized as follows:

Agency	N	Youth	Adults
Employment	43	Positive (14:7)	Negative (14:8)
Health	32	Neutral (10:10)	Negative (12:7)
Miscellaneous	88	Positive (12:9)	Neutral-Negative (10:9)
Education	133	Positive (11:7)	Neutral-Negative (11:10)
Welfare	170	Positive (15:8)	Neutral (11:11)
Law and Corrections	230	Positive (13:9)	Negative (15:8)

These responses indicate that the agency person's view of the young Indian in the Twin Cities was predominately positive. Only respondents from health agencies made less than a favorable judgment on balance, and that judgment was neutral. Descriptive adjectives attached to Twin Cities Indian youth by respondents from all six agency categories were: untrustworthy, brave, unreliable, sad, honest, knowledgeable, interested, ambitious and unwise. Consensus about descriptive adjectives for five of the six agency groups studied centered around the terms insincere, friendly, intelligent, cruel, active, undependable, polite and peace-loving. There was consensus among four of the six agency groups about the appropriateness of the terms neat, modern, and religious. Three of the six agency groups described young Indians as quiet and likeable.

Second, the prevailing agency view of the Indian adult in the Twin Cities tended to be negative, although one agency (welfare) produced a neutral rating, and two others (education and miscellaneous)

were only slightly negative. Descriptive adjectives deemed appropriate for Twin Cities adult Indians by respondents from all six agency categories were: ignorant, hard-working, cruel, sincere, peace-loving, dependable and quiet. Agreement about descriptive terms for five of the six agency groups studied included stupid, unsociable, rational, unlikeable, dishonest, polite, unreliable and bored. There was consensus among four of the six agency groups about the appropriateness of the terms irreligious, traditionalistic, sad, active, cowardly, untrustworthy and courteous. Three of the six agency groups described adult Indians as friendly and ambitious.

From these data, it can be seen that with law and corrections personnel, employment personnel rated Indian adults lowest when compared with the other four agency categories. The effects of these views upon the Indian person seeking employment are, of course, not ascertainable from these data, but it is apparent that Minneapolis employment personnel are not particularly enthusiastic about the Indian adults with whom they come into contact. It is probable that these attitudes do negatively affect the style and impact of job counselling and other forms of professional-client interaction.

Other data concerning Minneapolis employment personnel exist that serve to modify somewhat the impact of the foregoing responses, removing to an extent the impression of simple prejudice and casting the responses of employment personnel into language ordinarily

utilized for evaluating persons deemed culturally deprived or different.

Twenty-four management-level personnel in Minneapolis employment agencies were interviewed concerning their professional relationships with Indians. They were also asked to make certain judgments concerning Indians not directly related to their jobs. Tables 13 - 28 summarize the responses of these managers, eighteen of whom were white, five Indian, and one Negro. Responses are listed in order of descending proportions.

Tables 13 - 28.

13. "About how many persons do you work with in an average day?"

11 to 25	29.2%
5 or less	16.7
26 to 50	12.5
Very indefinite, it varies	12.5
No answer	8.3
6 to 10	8.3
51 to 100	8.3
101 or more	4.2
	100.0%

14. "Of the persons you work with, about how many are American Indians?"

All, or virtually all	33.3%
6 to 10%	16.7
Very few	12.5
Less than 5%	12.5

14. Continued

11 to 25%	12.5
25% and above	8.3
No Answer	4.2
	100.0%

15. "Why do Indians come to you?"

Need help (specifically related to services of agency)	91.7%
"They don't come to me, I go to them"	4.2
For education and related services	4.2
	100.1%

16. "What problems do they seem to have?"

Educational and employment problems	33.3%
Drinking problems	16.7
Problems of city adjustment	12.5
Don't communicate; passive, shy	12.5
Problems of cultural adjustment	8.3
Lack of aggressiveness, initiative, identity, leadership	8.3
Problems of poverty; domestic problems	4.2
Health problems	4.2
	100.0%

17. "How do you deal with these problems?"

Give the services this agency offers, including referral in some cases	50.0%
Try to give special help	29.2
"I don't" (or "can't")	12.5
No Answer	4.2
Same as we deal with problems of others	4.2
	100.1%

18. "Generally speaking, do the Indians you see have special problems different from those of non-Indians you see?"

Passive; unagressive; apathetic; little self confidence, self-concept, or motivation	29.2%
Have more drinking problems	16.7
Less oriented to city life, transition from rural to urban	16.7
Less well educated	8.3
No Answer	4.2
No, or don't know	4.2
Less communication ("They don't understand me" or vice versa)	4.2
Don't keep appointments, unreliable, school truancy, drop out	4.2
Are more hostile, resentful, angry toward whites (sometimes due to white prejudice)	4.2
Are underachievers	4.2
Don't know "way around" or where resources are	4.2
	100.3%

19. "If an Indian is new to the city, what problems of adjustment do you think he faces?"

Employment, education or housing difficulties	33.3%
Can't find resources to help them	20.8
Orientation to city and/or its institutions, feelings of isolation and insecurity	12.5
Has to learn transportation system	12.5
Same as others in poverty group	8.3
No Answer	4.2

19. Continued

"They don't integrate"	4.2
Culture conflict, different values (motivation)	4.2
	100.0%

20. "Are you, in your work, prepared to help him with his adjustment?"

Yes	58.3%
No	20.8
Not applicable	8.3
No Answer	4.2
Yes, but only to a degree	4.2
Usually refer	4.2
	100.0%

21. "What difficulties do you have in helping him?"

No Answer, or none	37.5
Communication problems (culture, language)	25.0
Hampered by institutional or professional restrictions and/or limitations	16.7
"Can't help those who won't help themselves"	12.5
Communication problems (Indian mobility, lack of telephones, etc.)	4.2
Indians don't keep appointments	4.2
	100.1%

22. "Do you encourage Indians to return to reservations for services or to live?"

No	95.8%
Very seldom	4.2
	100.0%

23. "Why (do you encourage or discourage Indians about returning to reservations)?"

No Answer	45.8%
"They can't get help there," there's nothing for them there, better services here	25.0
Never had the opportunity to do so	12.5
A special situation, or temporary	8.3
They have a right to be here, free to choose	4.2
Not a good environment	4.2
	100.0%

24. "How long have you worked with Indians?"

Over 1 year to 5 years	37.5%
7 months to 1 year	20.8
Over 10 years	16.7
Over 5 years to 10 years	12.5
Less than 6 months	8.3
Doesn't apply	4.2
	100.0%

25. "Have you taken any special training to help you understand Indian people?"

No	70.8%
Yes	12.5
Social work training	8.3
Doesn't apply	4.2
Have attended workshops, conferences, etc.	4.2
	100.0%

26. "Do you find you are as successful in your dealings with Indians as with non-Indians?"

Yes	58.3%
No	12.5
Yes, but...(qualified yes)	8.3
No, but...(qualified no)	8.3
Varied degrees of success	8.3
Doesn't apply or don't work with Indians directly	4.2
	99.9%

27. "Would you say that Indians in this state have serious problems?"

Yes	87.5%
No	4.2
Same as other lower class groups	4.2
No answer	4.2
	100.1%

28. "If so, what kind of problems are there?"

"Poor Housing?"

Yes	83.3%
No answer	16.7
	100.0%

"Sanitation Problems?"

Yes	66.7%
No answer	29.2
No	4.1
	100.0%

28. Continued

"Health Problems?"

Yes	66.7%
No Answer	29.2
No	4.1
	100.0%

"Lack Job Opportunities?"

Yes	58.3%
No	25.0
No Answer	12.5
No, there is lack of education/training	4.2
	100.0%

"Unfair Labor Market?"

Yes	54.2%
No	29.2
No Answer	12.5
"It is changing"	4.1
	100.0%

"Lack Proper Education?"

Yes	54.2%
No Answer	32.2
No	4.2
Little or no further education after high school	4.2
Yes, education and training	4.2
	100.0%

28. Continued

"Drink Too Much? A Drinking Problem?"

Yes	45.8%
No Answer	37.5
No	4.2
Don't know	4.2
Some may, "but not the ones I see," hearsay	4.2
Not as a general rule; some do, some don't	4.2
	100.1%

"Is There General Discrimination Against Indians?"

No Answer	29.2%
Yes	29.2
No	16.7
Some, not always or not much	12.5
Yes, noting it is worse against Indians than against Negroes	4.2
Yes, noting it is not worse than Negroes suffer	4.2
Don't know	4.2
	100.2%

29. "Do you agree that reservations should be abolished?"

Disagree	50.0%
Agree - gradually	33.3
Don't know	16.7
	100.0%

30. "Do you agree that Indians can support themselves on reservations by hunting and fishing, and harvesting wild rice?

Disagree	75.0%
Don't Know	20.8
Agree	4.2
	100.0%

31. "Do you agree ~~that~~ Indians should go to the BIA when they need help?"

Agree	37.5%
Disagree	29.2
Don't Know	20.8
Agree - but should go to other agencies too	12.5
	100.0%

32. "Do you agree that, if Indians stay on reservations, the government gives them money and support?"

Agree	33.3%
Disagree	33.3
Don't know	29.2
They should earn their own	4.2
	100.0%

33. "Do you agree that it is better for Indians to live on reservations among their own people, it's their custom?"

Disagree	79.2%
Don't Know	12.5
Agree	8.3
	100.0%

34. "Do you believe that Indians have a poor standard of living?"

Yes	54.2%
No answer	41.7
Same as others in low-income groups	4.1
	100.0%

These data show a sensitivity to Indians and their problems on the part of employment personnel that is not so apparent from the foregoing material. These data also reveal, however, substantial feelings of impotence and confusion in dealing practically with the employment problems associated with these sentiments and points of view.

VII: Conclusions: Employment Problems and City Adaptation

A recent general survey and analysis of Indians and their problems of adaptation to the city was jointly conducted by the Minneapolis League of Women Voters and the Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota. The employment-related findings of this project serve to summarize many of the basic conditions revealed in the material presented earlier in this report, as well as some not already touched upon:

1. Many Indians migrate to Minneapolis in response to the attraction of job opportunities, yet many Indians looking for work in a competitive urban society are unprepared for it.

2. Indians new to the city may arrive with few clothes and little money. They may move in with already overcrowded friends or relatives. Such conditions make it difficult for Indians to maintain the sort of appearance necessary for finding employment.

3. Indians may be uneasy about working with non-Indians and about the prerequisites of work -- application blanks, interviews, referrals, and questions which seem too personal or irrelevant. Standardized tests are standardized for a majority, alien society.

4. Employment assistance provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is available by application through the Bureau's reservation offices. However, the Indian who comes to the city on his own is not eligible for help from the BIA, since BIA programs are viewed as a part of the Bureau's responsibility as trustee of Indian lands. This is doubtless confusing to many Indians. An Indian in a reservation area receiving services from the BIA believes that he has received these services because he is Indian, and not because of the trust status of his land. He comes to expect that he will not be eligible for assistance in the manner prescribed for non-Indians. When he comes to the city, then, he does not look for help in the channels set up to serve all citizens.

5. City and county agencies in the metropolitan area report that Indians tend not to use their services, or that they are easily discouraged and tend not to return.

6. Indians without marketable skills or with employment problems may be eligible for Human Resources Development services of the Minnesota State Employment Service designed to improve employability. Indians seem to prefer dealing with Indian employees of the MSES. The MSES has employment specialists outstationed at the Citzens Community Centers and it also utilizes neighborhood workers to reach the unemployed, including Indians.

7. The American Indian Employment and Guidance Center, established in 1962, was formed in the belief that special Indian problems necessitated a special Indian agency. Plagued by sporadic funding, the Center has had an intermittent history culminating in its funding by the BIA as the nation's first government-financed employment office for urban Indians. It is currently understood that BIA funds will not be continued after June, 1968.

8. It appears that Indians who come to the Indian Employment Center are persons who feel that they need an agency <u>for Indians</u>. If they are not willing or able to use the community's services, a service they <u>will</u> use may have to be provided.

9. Few Indians are government employees, perhaps due to difficulties in passing civil service examinations. Since 1962 only three formal and informal complaints have been filed by Indians with the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission.

10. A few Indians are managing to work their way around civil service problems through the New Careers Program.

11. The Minneapolis Rehabilitation Center's "Plans for Progress" project is one which serves clients referred by the Youth Opportunity Center for rehabilitation of job attitudes and training for stable employment. Twelve of the eighteen youths in the project are Indian.

12. It appears that many Indian women seek domestic work. Placements of this sort occur regularly at the State Employment Service and at Unity Settlement House.

13. It appears that few Indians become involved with such organizations as the Career Clinic for Mature Women, TCOIC, and the Public Schools' Work Opportunity Center.

14. The Equal Opportunity Commission of the federal government reported last fall that there were 785 American Indians employed in the five-county metropolitan area. Of these, 148 held white collar jobs and 637 (81%) held blue collar jobs. The survey covered all employers having 100 or more employees, or having five or more employees and a federal government contract in excess of $50,000. According to a newspaper report, this survey covered 292,000 out of a total of 303,000 persons employed in the area.

15. For that portion of the Indian population accepting the standards, customs and traditions of "white America", employment presents no real problems. However, other Indians seem to have rejected some of these values of "getting ahead" and acquiring material wealth as having little meaning to them.

16. At various times, an Indian newcomer center or an all-Indian workshop have been suggested as a bridge between reservation life and the city.

17. New approaches will have to be developed for the employment of Indian citizens. Involved in such approaches must be the recognition of cultural factors, unfamiliarity with and distrust of established institutions and testing techniques, and confusion caused by the proliferation of agencies that want to be of help.

These considerations, together with discussions held by Training Center personnel with employment professionals, suggest some rather specific needs of Indian Americans which may have to be fulfilled before successful employment in an urban environment can be expected:

1. The Indian needs orientation to the urban environment. Maps, detailed directions and/or a special tour may be appropriate. An explanation and demonstration of how to use the public transportation system as well as rudimentary training in the use of telephones (as well as how to get one installed in one's residence) may be necessary.

2. Assistance in finding suitable housing may be needed. We have already noted the culturally-rooted tendency to move in with relatives, often causing deplorable overcrowding. So that inadequate housing will not become an additional problem for the Indian new to the city, it should be discussed with him. Indians already established in the city may be helpful here in pointing out alternative housing arrangements. The advantages of establishing a <u>permanent</u> residence should be explained to new Indian.

3. Extensive help with shopping, money management and family budgeting may be needed. It may be necessary to explain the difference between "wage" and "take-home pay", and it may be important to explain the meaning of income taxes and social security. Procedures for opening a bank account, cashing checks and establishing credit may have to be explained.

4. The use of utilities and appliances may need explanation and demonstration. The Indian from the reservation may not have had experience with modern plumbing, heating and refrigeration.

5. Assistance may be needed in understanding male and female roles in an urban, industrialized setting. The Indian woman needs to recognize that managing a city family's income prudently is not unlike her previous role of managing natural resources on the reservation. The Indian man must learn that employment is the expected male behavior in city life. Fundamental orientation in personal hygiene, suitable dress for different occasions, and expected family behavior and responsibility may be necessary.

6. Job adjustment problems may need special attention. Apparently, many job-related factors cause difficulty for Indians. Some agency personnel report that few Indians have given thought to vocational goals, so it may be necessary to develop a vocational plan in collaboration with an Indian client. The long-run advantages of a stable work record need to be impressed on Indian clients as well as the possibilities for upward occupational mobility through special education and training. Techniques for getting and holding a job may need to be taught. Preparation for a job interview (including role-playing), practice in filling out applications for work, and, in general, what to expect about the employment process may be helpful. The Indian's sensitivity to criticism and deep-seated distrust of the white man may have to be discussed with him and with potential employers. Initial "starting" costs for employment, such as work uniforms and work shoes may have to be met. If possible, it might be helpful to place the Indian in a work invironment containing other Indians instead of one which is a "sea of white faces". Workman's Compensation and Unemployment Insurance should be explained.

7. Aid in the use of medical facilities may have to be given. Adequate medical care may be available through an employer's benefit program, but it will need to be explained. School medical facilities for children should be outlined.

8. It may be wise to stress the advantages of formal education for children. Counseling on educational opportunities for children and adults may be vital to the long-run success of Indians, and they must realize its value.

9. Legal aid may be needed. If Indians are ever to achieve full legal status, they need to understand their rights and responsibilities under the law.

IX. Recommendations

The distinctions drawn here between a population of established, resident Indians and a population of mobile, recently-arrived, job-seeking Indians may have implications for the structure of agency services and assistance.

For the migrant reservation Indian, Indian-oriented and Indian-run employment offices seem to be useful facilities as contact agencies. They attract a substantial number of Indians who are in need of specialized,

competent, professional help with employment and employment-related problems. These are applicants with very little in the way of formal credentials to present to an employer, and it seems that they need considerable assistance in making a satisfactory work adjustment. The dimensions of the task suggest the usefulness of solid funding on a continuing basis so that Indian employment agencies can attract competent professionals (Indian or non-Indian) who have the capabilities of establishing fundamental employability services for a population with unique problems.

With the current pressures to employ the disadvantaged, jobs should be available in the Twin Cities for Indian Americans. But the population of applicants described earlier in this report may require substantial supportive services and benefits such as relocation aid, transportation and initial maintenance money, welfare payments, and orientation to the problems of city life and work. From the data, it does not seem that these particular applicants ordinarily receive such aid from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Perhaps there is a need to fashion new programs of service and related research to meet the needs of Indians migrating from the reservations to the Twin Cities and other urban areas.

Whatever the intent of the Bureau's relocation assistance program, it does not seem to be working for these Indians. If they are to succeed without supportive services and benefits provided by the Bureau, Indian employment agencies need capable administrators who can take advantage of all available community resources and who can teach their applicants the

fundamentals of job finding and job retention.

Additional study of Indians who successfully make the transition to city life and become established city residents would be fruitful. A major barrier, even with Indians established in the city, seems to be reluctance on their part to participate in established institutions designed to ameliorate social problems. It may be that the avenue of intensified outreach with qualified Indian social workers can be profitably used. To be effective on a broad scale, however, this approach would necessitate the identification and training of Indian social workers, who appear to be in short supply. Another approach (and one which is not necessarily mutually exclusive) would be to channel more resources into existing Indian centers. As this report has noted, the Minneapolis American Indian Employment Center lacks adequate and stable funding, a condition detrimental to its functioning. It may be that an effective Indian center is the only viable way in which to involve Indians in the solution of common problems. Certainly, it can be said that this solution has not been adequately tested. Until it is tested with adequate funding and competent professionals, it would be premature to discard this approach.

An effective Indian center could fulfill many needs. Besides providing pre-employment work orientation and facilitating job placement, it could, in a highly personalized way, see that Indians receive help from appropriate agencies. It could be a center for the location of temporary and permanent housing for Indians. It could monitor the needs of its special populations for education, then structure courses or training sessions to fit these unique needs, working in cooperation with educational institutions. It

could provide a social and recreational center for Indians. In short, it could serve important needs for both resident Indians and migrant Indians.

It might be worthwhile to attempt to structure experimental programs involving the employment of Indians as a group by private employers, perhaps using such incentives as MDTA.

Certainly, agency personnel in a local Indian center - whether they are Indian or non-Indian - should have a good grasp of Chippewa history and culture. Since White Earth, Red Lake and Leech Lake appear to be the major sources of migration to the Twin Cities, local agency personnel should know conditions on these reservations, and probalby should have contact with reservation personnel.

If stable Indian centers existed in the Twin Cities, it would be possible to undertake a special demonstration and research program structured around the phenomenon of Indian migration.

Specifically, it is suggested here that a special demonstration and research program be undertaken which would be designed to:

1. Ascertain the relevant social services these migration patterns require;
2. Meet the social service needs of mobile Indians;
3. Determine the scope and nature of Minnesota Indian migration patterns;
4. Develop a model for comprehending and dealing with the phenomenon of Indian migration in other states and regions;

5. Attempt an assessment of the possible meaning of these migratory patterns and, to some extent, the services applicable to them, for general rural-urban population movements;
6. Make specific applications of the findings of this program to such developing projects as the Minnesota Experimental City, itself likely to be located near several large Indian reservations.

It is proposed that two major sets of contact points be established within Minnesota to monitor Indian movement and to serve Indians (or refer them for service) in the most effective manner possible:

1. At reservation community action agencies, and
2. At urban Indian centers in Duluth, Minneapolis and St. Paul.

One set of contact points would reside with the Community Action Agencies at each Minnesota Indian reservation identified as a significant point of in- or out-migration. Personnel assigned to these contact points would be charged with recording the movement of Indians and with providing orientation services designed to make the reservation - city adjustment less difficult.

Appointments or contacts for Indians moving to the city could be made by these CAA persons with their counter-parts -- personnel at appropriate Indian centers or other agencies to be determined in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth for those urban areas.

In this manner the arrival of an Indian or an Indian family would be anticipated in the metropolitan area, and appropriate steps could be taken to ensure that housing, jobs and supportive services would be available.

"Delegate" agencies could be alerted in advance so that referrals from the agencies in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth could be expedited. Basic training and orientation in city life, including employment, could be provided by such personnel located at the second set of contact points in the urban areas.

Since a high quality of service would be needed from the personnel at the urban contact points, alternative staffing possibilities need to be explored. Persons with expertise in community health and welfare resources such as United Fund Citizens' Aides might be utilized an/or University of Minnesota Indian students could be employed on a work-study basis.

A P P E N D I X - D A T A

Table IV-1

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER APPLICANTS

(Figures are percentages)

Characteristic	Males (N=551)	Females (N=192)	Males and Females Combined (N=743)
Sex:			
NA	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	100.0	0.0	74.2
Female	0.0	100.0	25.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Telephone:			
NA - Unknown	23.8	22.4	23.4
Yes	47.7	54.2	49.4
No	28.5	23.4	27.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Car:			
NA - Unknown	3.3	3.6	3.3
Yes	24.0	13.0	21.1
No	72.8	83.3	75.5
	100.1	99.9	99.9
Age:			
NA - Unknown	.7	.5	.7
Up to and including 15	.4	2.1	.8
16 - 22	38.8	55.7	43.2
23 - 40	47.7	33.9	44.1
41 - 64	12.3	7.8	11.2
65 and above	0.0	0.0	0.0
	99.9	100.0	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Marital Status:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
NA - Unknown	2.9	1.0	2.4
Single	55.9	57.8	56.4
Married	31.4	24.5	29.6
Separated	6.0	12.0	7.5
Divorced	2.7	3.6	3.0
Widowed	1.1	1.0	1.1
	100.0	99.9	100.0
Physical Defects:			
NA - Unknown	2.5	2.6	2.6
Yes	7.3	3.1	6.2
No	90.2	94.3	91.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Military Service:			
NA - Unknown	3.1	16.1	6.5
Yes	38.8	3.1	29.6
No	58.1	80.7	63.9
	100.0	99.9	100.0
Indian Blood:			
NA - Unknown	7.3	10.4	8.1
Less than $\frac{1}{4}$	4.2	7.8	5.1
$\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$	33.0	24.5	30.8
$\frac{1}{2}$ to full	55.0	57.3	55.6
White	.4	0.0	.3
Negro	.2	0.0	.1
	100.1	100.0	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Tribal Affiliation:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
NA - Unknown	7.3	6.8	7.1
Chippewa	82.2	83.9	82.6
Sioux	7.4	5.7	7.0
Other Indian	2.9	3.6	3.1
White	.2	0.0	.1
	100.0	100.0	99.9
Reservation:			
White Earth	21.8	24.0	22.3
Mille Lacs	9.8	9.4	9.7
Fond du Lac	2.5	6.3	3.5
Red Lake	21.8	22.9	22.1
Leech Lake	14.9	16.7	15.3
Nett Lake	2.4	3.6	2.7
Grand Portage	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wisconsin	.4	0.0	.3
North and South Dakota	3.6	6.3	4.3
Other	22.9	10.9	19.8
	99.9	100.1	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Male and Females Combined
Place at Birth:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
White Earth	16.5	15.1	16.2
Mille Lacs	2.9	3.6	3.1
Fond du Lac	0.0	0.0	0.0
Red Lake	20.3	21.9	20.7
Leech Lake	.7	0.0	.5
Nett Lake	1.5	1.0	1.3
Grand Portage	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wisconsin	.7	.5	.7
North and South Dakota	5.6	5.7	5.7
Other	51.7	52.1	51.8
	99.9	99.9	100.0
Assistance from BIA:			
NA - Unknown	5.3	2.6	4.6
Yes	23.6	17.7	22.1
No	71.1	79.7	73.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Type of Assistance:			
NA - Unknown	77.2	86.5	79.5
Relocation	15.2	4.7	12.5
Other Assistance	7.6	8.9	7.9
	100.0	100.1	99.9

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Time in Twin Cities:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
NA - Unknown	4.4	3.6	4.2
Less than 30 days	32.7	25.5	30.8
1 - 3 months	8.7	9.4	8.9
4 - 6 months	6.2	6.3	6.2
7 - 11 months	4.9	6.3	5.2
1 - 2 years	9.1	13.0	10.1
3 - 5 years	9.3	9.4	9.3
6 - 9 years	6.0	8.3	6.6
10 years and above	18.9	18.2	18.7
	100.2	100.0	100.0
Length of Time at Present Address:			
NA - Unknown	9.6	3.6	8.1
Less than 30 days	37.2	32.8	36.1
1 - 3 months	15.8	21.4	17.2
4 - 6 months	10.7	13.5	11.4
7 - 11 months	6.7	7.3	6.9
1 - 2 years	12.5	15.1	13.2
3 - 5 years	5.1	3.6	4.7
6 - 9 years	.9	1.6	1.1
10 years and above	1.5	1.0	1.3
	100.0	99.9	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Cost of Rent and Utilities:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=742)
NA - Unknown	54.1	44.8	51.7
Costs nothing	.5	0.0	.4
$1 - $24 per month	1.8	1.6	1.7
$25 - $49 per month	5.8	6.8	6.1
$50 - $74 per month	12.7	17.2	13.9
$75 - $99 per month	16.7	20.8	17.8
$100 - $124 per month	7.1	6.3	6.9
$125 - $149 per month	1.1	1.0	1.1
$150 and above per month	.2	1.6	.5
	100.0	100.1	100.1
Debts:			
NA - Unknown	18.5	18.2	18.4
Yes	15.1	17.2	15.6
No	66.4	64.6	65.9
	100.0	100.0	99.9
Present Assistance (Welfare):			
NA - Unknown	12.9	13.5	13.1
Yes	3.3	10.4	5.1
No	83.8	76.0	81.8
	100.0	99.9	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Union Membership:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
NA - Unknown	14.7	17.2	15.3
Yes	.4	0.0	.3
No	84.9	82.8	84.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Education:			
NA - Unknown	2.5	2.6	2.6
0 - 5 years	1.3	1.6	1.3
6 - 8 years	19.4	12.0	17.5
9 years	15.6	11.5	14.5
10 years	22.7	20.3	22.1
11 years	16.7	29.7	20.1
12 years	19.4	19.3	19.4
13 or above (no degree)	2.4	3.1	2.6
College Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.1	100.1
Special Skills and Training:			
NA - Unknown	10.5	14.0	11.4
Military Schooling and Training	3.3	3.6	3.4
OJT	33.9	24.0	31.4
Specific work not normally considered a skill	52.3	58.3	53.8
	100.0	99.9	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Interest in Further Education and Training:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
NA - Unknown	9.6	9.9	9.7
Yes	55.9	58.3	56.5
No	34.5	31.8	33.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Type of Work Interest:			
NA - Unknown	9.1	10.9	9.6
Anything	31.2	15.1	27.1
General Factory, Warehouse	26.5	39.6	29.9
Driving and Auto Service	6.5	0.0	4.8
Construction Trades	2.5	.5	2.0
Clerical and Office	.5	10.9	3.2
Household, Domestic, Hosp.	.5	14.1	4.0
Specific Occupation not covered above	23.0	8.9	19.4
	99.8	100.0	100.0
Harvest Wild Rice:			
NA - Unknown	16.7	19.8	17.5
Yes	35.6	22.9	32.3
No	47.7	57.3	50.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0

Characteristic	Males	Females	Males and Females Combined
Number of Referrals:	(N=551)	(N=192)	(N=743)
NA - Unknown	21.1	20.8	21.0
One	56.6	55.7	56.4
Two	13.2	17.2	14.3
Three	5.4	3.6	5.0
Four	2.4	1.0	2.0
Five	.7	0.0	.5
Six	.2	1.6	.5
Seven	.4	0.0	.3
Eight and Above	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	99.9	100.0
Agency to Which Referred:			
NA - Unknown	26.5	28.7	27.0
Social Service	5.1	3.6	4.7
Vocational Training	2.9	0.0	2.2
OEO Programs	3.1	5.2	3.6
Job Corps and NYC	2.9	3.1	3.0
Financial Assistance	1.1	0.0	.8
Commercial Store or Plant	58.4	59.4	58.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

MALES AND FEMALES COMBINED (N = 743)

Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates
(Tables in percentages; N's in parentheses)

A. Sex

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	0	0
Male	74.3	73.6
Female	25.7	26.4
	100.0	100.0

B. Telephone

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	26.6	12.3
Yes	45.3	63.8
No	28.1	29.3
	100.0	100.0

C. Car

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	4.0	1.2
Yes	19.7	26.4
No	76.4	72.4
	100.0	100.0

D. Age

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	.7	.6
Up to 15	1.0	0
16 - 22	44.3	39.3
23 - 40	41.4	54.0
41 - 64	12.6	6.1
65 and above	0	0
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

Males and Females: NHSG vs. HSG

E. Marital Status

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	2.4	2.5
Single	57.1	54.0
Married	28.6	33.1
Separated	8.3	4.9
Divorced	2.6	4.3
Widowed	1.0	1.2
	100.0	100.0

F. Physical Defects

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	2.6	2.5
Yes	6.6	4.9
No	90.9	92.6
	100.0	100.0

G. Military Service

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	6.7	5.5
Yes	25.9	42.9
No	67.4	51.5
	100.0	100.0

H. Indian Blood

NHSG	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	8.1	8.0
less than ¼	4.3	8.0
¼ - ½	30.3	32.5
½ to full	56.7	51.5
White	.3	0
Negro	.2	0
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

Males and Females: NHSG vs. HSG

I. Tribal Affiliation

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	7.4	6.1
Chippewa	84.1	77.3
Sioux	5.7	11.7
Other Indian	2.6	4.9
White	.2	0
	100.0	100.0

K. Place of Birth

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
White Earth	16.4	15.3
Mille Lacs	3.4	1.8
Fond du Lac	0	0
Red Lake	21.2	19.0
Leech Lake	.5	.6
Nett Lake	1.4	1.2
Grand Portage	0	0
Wisconsin	.9	0
North & South Dakota	5.5	6.1
Other	50.7	55.8
	100.0	100.0

J. Reservation

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
White Earth	23.3	19.0
Mille Lacs	10.0	8.6
Fond du Lac	3.4	3.7
Red Lake	22.8	19.6
Leech Lake	14.5	18.4
Nett Lake	2.1	4.9
Grand Portage	0	0
Wisconsin	.3	0
North & South Dakota	4.1	4.9
Other	19.5	20.9
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

Males and Females: NHSG vs. HSG

L. Assistance from BIA

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	5.2	2.5
Yes	17.9	36.8
No	76.9	60.7
	100.0	100.0

M. Type of Assistance

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	83.8	64.4
Relocation	10.9	18.4
Other	5.3	17.2
	100.0	100.0

N. Time in Twin Cities

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	3.3	7.4
less than 30 days	32.1	26.4
1 - 3 months	9.0	8.6
4 - 6 months	5.9	7.4
7 - 11 months	4.7	7.4
1 - 2 years	10.3	9.2
3 - 5 years	10.0	6.7
6 - 9 years	6.6	6.7
10 years +	18.3	20.2
	100.0	100.0

O. Length of Time at Present Address

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	8.1	8.0
less than 30 days	37.4	31.3
1 - 3 months	16.2	20.9
4 - 6 months	11.7	10.4
7 - 11 months	6.9	6.7
1 - 2 years	13.3	12.9
3 - 5 years	4.5	5.5
6 - 9 years	.9	1.8
10 years +	1.0	2.5
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

Males and Females: NHSG vs. HSG

P. Cost of Rent and Utilities

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	53.3	46.0
0	.3	.6
$1 - $24 per month	1.6	2.5
$25 - $49 per month	6.6	4.3
$50 - $74 per month	13.4	15.3
$75 - $99 per month	16.9	20.9
$100 - $124 per month	6.9	6.7
$125 - $149 per month	.5	3.1
$150 and above	.5	.6
	100.0	100.0

Q. Debts

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	19.3	15.3
Yes	13.1	24.5
No	67.6	60.1
	100.0	100.0

R. Present Assistance (Welfare)

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	13.4	11.7
Yes	5.2	4.9
No	81.4	83.4
	100.0	100.0

S. Union Membership?

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	16.6	11.0
Yes	.3	0
No	83.1	89.0
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

Males and Females: NHSG vs. HSG

T. Special Skills and Training

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	11.9	8.6
Military	3.1	4.3
OJT	27.8	44.2
Other *	57.3	42.9
	100.0	100.0

U. Interest in Further Education and Training

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	9.1	11.6
Yes	56.4	57.1
No	34.5	31.3
	100.0	100.0

V. Type of Work Interested In

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	9.8	8.6
Anything	27.6	25.2
Gen'l. Factory, Warehouse, Labor	30.7	27.0
Driving and Auto Services	4.5	6.1
Construction Trades	2.1	1.8
Clerical and Office Work	2.2	6.7
Household Domestic & Hospital	4.5	2.5
Special occupation not covered above	18.6	22.1
	100.0	100.0

* Specific responses generally not considered to be a skill - e.g., "dishwashing", "driving a car", etc.

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

Males and Females: NHSG vs. HSG

W. Harvest Wild Rice

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	17.2	18.4
Yes	32.8	30.7
No	50.0	50.9
	100.0	100.0

X. Number of Referrals

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	20.2	23.9
One	57.1	54.0
Two	14.8	12.3
Three	4.7	6.1
Four	2.1	1.8
Five	.5	.6
Six	.3	1.2
Seven	.3	0
Eight & above	0	0
	100.0	100.0

Y. Agency to Which Referred

	(580) NHSG	(163) HSG
NA	26.4	29.4
Social Service	4.3	6.1
Vocational Training	2.4	1.2
OEO Programs	3.1	5.5
Job Corps & NYC	3.8	0
Financial Assistance	.9	.6
Commercial Store or Plant	59.1	57.1
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

MALES (N = 551)

Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates
(Tables in percentages; N's in parentheses)

A. Telephone

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	26.7	13.3
Yes	44.1	60.8
No	29.2	25.8
	100.0	100.0

B. Car

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	3.9	.8
Yes	22.5	29.2
No	73.5	70.0
	100.0	100.0

C. Age

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	.7	.8
Up to & including 15	.5	0
16 - 22	40.6	32.5
23 - 40	44.5	59.2
41 - 64	13.7	7.5
65 and above	0	0
	100.0	100.0

D. Marital Status

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	2.8	3.3
Single	57.1	51.7
Married	29.9	36.7
Separated	6.7	3.3
Divorced	2.6	3.3
Widowed	.9	1.7
	100.0	100.0

Males: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

E. Physical Defects

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	2.6	2.5
Yes	7.4	6.7
No	90.0	90.8
	100.0	100.0

F. Military Service

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	3.9	0
Yes	34.1	55.8
No	61.9	44.2
	100.0	100.0

G. Indian Blood

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	7.0	8.3
less than 1/4	4.2	4.2
1/4 - 1/2	32.7	34.2
1/2 - full	55.5	53.5
White	.5	0
Negro	.2	0
	100.0	100.0

H. Tribal Affiliation

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	7.7	5.8
Chippewa	84.2	75.0
Sioux	5.6	14.2
Other Indian	2.3	5.0
White	.2	0
	100.0	100.0

Males: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

I. Reservation

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
White Earth	23.4	15.8
Mille Lacs	10.0	9.2
Fond du Lac	2.6	2.5
Red Lake	22.0	20.8
Leech Lake	14.8	15.0
Nett Lake	1.6	5.0
Grand Portage	0	0
Wisconsin	.5	0
North & South Dakota	3.2	5.0
Other	21.8	26.7
	100.0	100.0

J. Place of Birth

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
White Earth	17.2	14.2
Mille Lacs	3.0	2.5
Fond du Lac	0	0
Red Lake	20.4	20.0
Leech Lake	.7	.8
Nett Lake	1.6	.8
Grand Portage	0	0
Wisconsin	.9	0
North & South Dakota	5.1	7.5
Other	51.0	54.2
	100.0	100.0

K. Assistance from BIA

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	6.0	2.5
Yes	20.0	36.7
No	74.0	60.8
	100.0	100.0

L. Type of Assistance

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	80.9	63.3
Relocation	13.7	20.8
Other	5.3	15.8
	100.0	100.0

Males: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

M. Time in Twin Cities

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	3.5	7.5
less than 30 days	34.6	25.8
1 - 3 months	8.6	9.2
4 - 6 months	5.6	8.3
7 - 11 months	3.7	9.2
1 - 2 years	9.7	6.7
3 - 5 years	10.0	6.7
6 - 9 years	5.8	6.7
10 years +	18.6	20.0
	100.0	100.0

N. Length of Time at Present Address

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	10.0	8.3
less than 30 days	39.2	30.0
1 - 3 months	14.6	20.0
4 - 6 months	10.2	12.5
7 - 11 months	6.3	8.3
1 - 2 years	13.2	10.0
3 - 5 years	4.9	5.8
6 - 9 years	.7	1.7
10 years +	.9	3.3
	100.0	100.0

O. Cost of Rent and Utilities

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	56.4	45.8
0	.5	.8
$1 - $24/month	1.6	2.5
$25 - $49/month	5.8	5.8
$50 - $74/month	12.3	14.2
$75 - $99/month	15.5	20.8
$100 - $124/month	7.2	6.7
$125 - $149/month	.5	3.3
$150 +	.2	0
	100.0	100.0

P. Debts

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	20.0	13.3
Yes	12.8	23.3
No	67.3	63.3
	100.0	100.0

Males: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

Q. Present Assistance (Welfare)

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	14.2	8.3
Yes	3.7	1.7
No	82.1	90.0
	100.0	100.0

R. Union Membership?

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	16.2	9.2
Yes	.5	0
No	83.3	90.8
	100.0	100.0

S. Special Skills and Training

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	11.1	7.5
Military	3.5	2.5
OJT	29.9	48.3
Other *	55.4	41.7
	100.0	100.0

T. Interest in Further Education and Training

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	9.3	10.8
Yes	55.9	55.8
No	34.8	33.3
	100.0	100.0

* Specific responses generally not considered to be a skill - e.g., "dish-washing", "driving a car", etc.

Males: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

U. Type of Work Interested In

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	9.5	7.5
Anything	31.8	29.2
Gen'l Factory, Warehouse, Labor	26.0	28.3
Driving & Auto Services	6.0	8.3
Construction Trades	2.8	1.7
Clerical and Office Work	.5	.8
Household Domestic and Hospital	.7	0
Special occupation not covered above	22.7	24.2
	100.0	100.0

V. Harvest Wild Rice

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	16.9	15.8
Yes	37.1	30.0
No	45.9	54.2
	100.0	100.0

W. Number of Referrals

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	20.2	24.2
One	56.8	55.8
Two	14.6	8.3
Three	4.9	7.5
Four	2.3	2.5
Five	.7	.8
Six	0	.8
Seven	.5	0
Eight & above	0	0
	100.0	100.0

X. Agency to Which Referred

	(431) NHSG	(120) HSG
NA	26.0	28.3
Social Service	4.9	5.8
Vocational Training	3.2	1.7
OEO Programs	2.6	5.0
Job Corps and NYC	3.7	0
Financial Assistance	1.2	.8
Commercial Store or Plant	58.5	58.3
	100.0	100.0

AMERICAN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER DATA

FEMALES (N = 189)

Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates
(Tables in percentages; N's in parentheses)

A. Telephone

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	26.2	7.5
Yes	49.0	72.5
No	24.8	20.0
	100.0	100.0

B. Car

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	4.0	2.5
Yes	11.4	20.0
No	84.6	77.5
	100.0	100.0

C. Age

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	.7	0
Up to & including 15	2.7	0
16 - 22	55.0	57.5
23 - 40	32.2	42.5
41 - 64	9.4	0
65 +	0	0
	100.0	100.0

D. Marital Status

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	1.3	0
Single	57.0	60.0
Married	24.8	25.0
Separated	12.8	10.0
Divorced	2.7	5.0
Widowed	1.3	0
	100.0	100.0

Females: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

E. Physical Defects

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	2.7	2.5
Yes	4.0	0
No	93.3	97.5
	100.0	100.0

F. Military Service

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	14.8	20.0
Yes	2.0	7.5
No	83.2	72.5
	100.0	100.0

G. Indian Blood

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	11.4	7.5
less than ¼	4.7	17.5
¼ - ½	23.5	25.0
½ - Full	60.4	50.0
White	0	0
Negro	0	0
	100.0	100.0

H. Tribal Affiliation

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	6.7	7.5
Chippewa	83.9	82.5
Sioux	6.0	5.0
Other Indian	3.4	5.0
White	0	0
	100.0	100.0

Females: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

I. Reservation

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
White Earth	22.8	30.0
Mille Lacs	10.1	7.5
Fond du Lac	6.0	5.0
Red Lake	24.8	17.5
Leech Lake	13.4	27.5
Nett Lake	3.4	2.5
Grand Portage	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0
North & South Dakota	6.7	5.0
Other	12.8	5.0
	100.0	100.0

J. Place of Birth

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
White Earth	14.1	20.0
Mille Lacs	4.7	0
Fond du Lac	0	0
Red Lake	23.5	17.5
Leech Lake	0	0
Nett Lake	.7	0
Grand Portage	0	0
Wisconsin	.7	0
North & South Dakota	6.7	2.5
Other	49.7	60.0
	100.0	100.0

K. Assistance from BIA

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	2.7	2.5
Yes	12.1	37.5
No	85.2	60.0
	100.0	100.0

L. Type of Assistance

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	91.9	65.0
Relocation	2.7	12.5
Other	5.4	22.5
	100.0	100.0

Females: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

M. Time in Twin Cities

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	2.7	5.0
less than 30 days	24.8	27.5
1 - 3 months	10.1	7.5
4 - 6 months	6.7	5.0
7 - 11 months	7.4	2.5
1 - 2 years	12.1	15.0
3 - 5 years	10.1	7.5
6 - 9 years	8.7	7.5
10 years +	17.4	22.5
	100.0	100.0

N. Length of Time at Present Address

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	2.7	2.5
less than 30 days	32.2	37.5
1 - 3 months	20.8	25.0
4 - 6 months	16.1	5.0
7 - 11 months	8.7	2.5
1 - 2 years	13.4	20.0
3 - 5 years	3.4	5.0
6 - 9 years	1.3	2.5
10 years +	1.3	0
	100.0	100.0

O. Cost of Rent and Utilities

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	44.3	42.5
0	0	0
$1 - $24/month	1.3	2.5
$25 - $49/month	8.7	0
$50 - $74/month	16.8	20.0
$75 - $99/month	20.8	22.5
$100 - $124/month	6.0	7.5
$125 - $149/month	.7	2.5
$150 & above/month	1.3	2.5
	100.0	100.0

P. Debts

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	17.4	20.0
Yes	14.1	30.0
No	68.5	50.0
	100.0	100.0

Females: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduates

Q. Present Assistance (Welfare)

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	11.4	20.0
Yes	9.4	15.0
No	79.2	65.0
	100.0	100.0

R. Union Membership?

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	17.4	12.5
Yes	0	0
No	82.6	87.5
	100.0	100.0

S. Special Skills and Training

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	14.1	10.0
Military	2.0	10.0
OJT	21.5	32.5
Other *	62.4	47.5
	100.0	100.0

T. Interest in Further Education and Training

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	8.7	15.0
Yes	57.7	60.0
No	33.6	25.0
	100.0	100.0

* Specific responses generally not considered to be a skill - e.g., "dish-washing", "driving a car", etc.

Females: Non-High School Graduates vs. High School Graduate

U. Type of Work Interested In

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	10.7	12.5
Anything	15.4	15.0
Gen'l. factory, warehouse, labor	44.3	20.0
Driving and Auto Services	0	0
Construction trades	0	2.5
Clerical and Office Work	7.4	22.5
Household domestic and Hospital	15.4	10.0
Specific occupation not covered above	6.7	17.5
	100.0	100.0

V. Harvest Wild Rice

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	18.1	27.5
Yes	20.1	30.0
No	61.7	42.5
	100.0	100.0

W. Number of Referrals

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	20.1	22.5
One	57.7	47.5
Two	15.4	25.0
Three	4.0	2.5
Four	1.3	0
Five	0	0
Six	1.3	2.5
Seven	0	0
Eight & above	0	0
	100.0	100.0

X. Agency to Which Referred

	(149) NHSG	(40) HSG
NA	27.5	30.0
Social Service	2.7	7.5
Vocational Training	0	0
OEO Programs	4.7	7.5
Job Corps & NYC	4.0	0
Financial Assistance	0	0
Commercial Store or Plant	61.1	55.0
	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX-QUESTIONNAIRES

TCCP - AMH - UAIS

INTERVIEWING WITH STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRES

The basic theory of the structured interview is that the same set of stimuli should be administered equally to all respondents in the sample. At first hand, this would seem to be a simple enough requirement. In practice, however, interviewing is one of the most demanding aspects of the research process. Some of the generalized aspects of the accumulated experience of interviewers, which facilitate the process and make it as systematic and scientific as possible, are as follows:

1. Legitimize Your Respondent. Explain that he is a member of a sample and how he came to be selected: by virtue of inner city residency.

2. Let Your Respondent Establish Rapport. Put your respondent at ease and help him establish a warm and friendly atmosphere.

3. Follow the Rules. Ask the questions exactly as stated in the questionnarie. If the respondent doesn't understand, repeat the question slowly. Avoid explanations. Follow the specified order of questions.

4. Be Neutral. Show neither surprise nor disapproval. Express neither agreement nor disagreement, since each respondent will try his utmost to discover what your expectations are and will (probably) try to conform to them.

5. Avoid the "halo effect". Treat each interview as a separate experience - as indeed it is. You may be prone, after a few interviews, to develop your own hypotheses, ideas about how answers are distributed in the population, and the like. But be very careful that these ideas are not reflected in your manner or inflection in asking the questions, or in the way you record the responses.

6. Record Fully. Where a checklist of answers is provided, check the answer which comes closest to the response; indicate no answer (NA) only if necessary.

If probes are provided and used, indicate this clearly. Be sure to ask all the questions, and then try to get answers to them all. If any of the questions go unanswered, the usefulness of the entire interview is reduced.

We suggest you practice interviewing someone (a friend, your roommate, someone in the class). This will help you to know the content of the questionnaire and give you the confidence essential to making the interview as quick and painless as possible.

Village or Town _____

1 - 4 Identification number (Interviewer: Leave Blank)

___ 1.
___ 2.
___ 3.
___ 4.

5. Sex

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Male
___ 3. Female

6. Telephone

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Yes
___ 3. No

7. Age

___ 1. NA or unknown
___ 2. Up to and including 15
___ 3. 16 - 23
___ 4. 23 - 40
___ 5. 41 - 64
___ 6. 65 and above

8. Marital status

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Single
___ 3. Married
___ 4. Separated
___ 5. Divorced
___ 6. Widowed

9. Head of Household

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Yes
___ 3. No

10. Education (number of school years completed)

___ 1. NA
___ 2. 0 - 5 years
___ 3. 6 - 8 years
___ 4. 9 years
___ 5. 10 years
___ 6. 11 years
___ 7. 12 years
___ 8. 13 years or above (no degree)
___ 9. College graduate

11. Children

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Yes
___ 3. No

12. Number of male children

___ 1. NA
___ 2. One
___ 3. Two
___ 4. Three
___ 5. Four
___ 6. Five
___ 7. Six
___ 8. Seven
___ 9. Eight

13. Number of female children

___ 1. NA
___ 2. One
___ 3. Two
___ 4. Three
___ 5. Four
___ 6. Five
___ 7. Six
___ 8. Seven
___ 9. Eight

14. Total number of children (both sexes)

___ 1. NA
___ 2. One
___ 3. Two
___ 4. Three
___ 5. Four
___ 6. Five
___ 7. Six
___ 8. Seven
___ 9. Eight and above

15. Number of children (both sexes) in primary school

___ 1. NA
___ 2. One
___ 3. Two
___ 4. Three
___ 5. Four
___ 6. Five
___ 7. Six and above

16. Number of children (both sexes) in secondary school

___ 1. NA
___ 2. One
___ 3. Two
___ 4. Three
___ 5. Four
___ 6. Five and above

17. Length of time lived in Twin Cities <u>during last move there</u>

___ 1. NA or none
___ 2. Less than 30 days
___ 3. 1 - 3 months
___ 4. 4 - 6 months
___ 5. 7 - 11 months
___ 6. 1 - 2 years
___ 7. 3 - 5 years
___ 8. 6 - 9 years
___ 9. 10 years and above

18. Length of time lived in Twin Cities <u>counting that move and all previous times lived there before</u>

___ 1. NA or none
___ 2. Less than 30 days
___ 3. 1 - 3 months
___ 4. 4 - 6 months
___ 5. 7 - 11 months
___ 6. 1 - 2 years
___ 7. 3 - 5 years
___ 8. 6 - 9 years
___ 9. 10 years and above

19. Length of time lived at present address

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Less than 30 days
___ 3. 1 - 3 months
___ 4. 4 - 6 months
___ 5. 7 - 11 months
___ 6. 1 - 2 years
___ 7. 3 - 5 years
___ 8. 6 - 9 years
___ 9. 10 years and above

20. Active duty in military service

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Yes
___ 3. No

21. Union member

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Yes
___ 3. No

22. Father's education (member of school years completed)

___ 1. NA
___ 2. 0 - 5 years
___ 3. 6 - 8 years
___ 4. 9 years
___ 5. 10 years
___ 6. 11 years
___ 7. 12 years
___ 8. 13 years
___ 9. College graduate

23. Mother's education (number of school years completed)

___ 1. NA
___ 2. 0 - 5 years
___ 3. 6 - 8 years
___ 4. 9 years
___ 5. 10 years
___ 6. 11 years
___ 7. 12 years
___ 8. 13 years
___ 9. College graduate

24. Your occupation

___ 1. NA
___ 2. None
___ 3. Unskilled work: janitor, garbage disposal, Unskilled labor: construction, railroad labor, miners, Domestics, babysitters (full-time), farm labor, Unemployed or Disabled
___ 4. Semi-skilled manual labors: assembly-line work City service with some stigma (maintenance, meter reader), truck, taxidrivers, chauffer, waiter, waitresses
___ 5. Any skilled workman: mechanic, repairman, cook, painter, plumber, City service: policeman, fireman, milkman, mailman, bus driver, Low clerical: order filler, dime store, movie clerk or cashier, One-man store, repair shop
___ 6. Most clerical: (lowest white collar) secretarial occupations highly skilled tradesmen, factory foreman, (Machinist, tailor, printer, employed photographer, cabinet maker), Small store owners, pharmacists, Average salesman-Wholesale items

___ 7. Skilled professionals: (experts, technicians, accountants, photographers) retail store merchants of medium sized concerns, insurance salesmen, representatives; plant or city superintendents: ie, clerical with some supervisory capacities, executive secretaries, average midwest farmer

___ 8. Highly skilled professionals: corporation scientists, middle-management executives, company owners, low-prestige ministry, military officers, high school teachers

___ 9. Learned professions: medicine, top-flight corporation executives and military personnel, creative occupations, ministry, stockbrokers, large farm owners

25. Your spouse's occupation (even if deceased)

___ 1. NA
___ 2. None
___ 3. Unskilled work: janitor, garbage disposal, Unskilled labor: construction, railroad labor, miners, Domestics, babysitters (full-time), farm labor, Unemployed or Disabled
___ 4. Semi-skilled manual labors: assembly-line work, City service with some stigma (maintenance, meter reader), truck, taxidrivers, chauffer, waiter, waitresses
___ 5. Any skilled workman: mechanic, repairman, cook, painter, plumber, City service: policeman, fireman, milkman, mailman, bus driver, Low clerical: order filler, dime store, movie clerk or cashier, One-man store, repair shop
___ 6. Most clerical: (lowest white collar) secretarial occupations highly skilled tradesmen, factory foreman, (Machinist, tailor, printer, employed photographer, cabinet maker), Small store owners, pharmacists, Average salesman-Wholesale items
___ 7. Skilled professionals: (experts, technicians, accountants, photographers) retail store merchants of medium sized concerns, insurance salesmen, representatives; plant or city superintendents: ie, clerical with some supervisory capacities, executive secretaries, average midwest farmer
___ 8. Highly skilled professionals: corporation scientists, middle-management executives, company owners, low-prestige ministry, military officers, high school teachers
___ 9. Learned professions: medicine, top-flight corporation executives and military personnel, creative occupations, ministry, stockbrokers, large farm owners

26. Your Father's occupation (even if deceased)

___ 1. NA
___ 2. None
___ 3. Unskilled work: janitor, garbage disposal, Unskilled labor: construction, railroad labor, miners, Domestics, babysitters (full-time), farm labor, Unemployed or Disabled
___ 4. Semi-skilled manual labors: assembly-line work, City service with some stigma (maintenance, meter reader), truck, taxidrivers, chauffer, waiter, waitresses
___ 5. Any skilled workman: mechanic, repairman, cook, painter, plumber, City service: policeman, fireman, milkman, mailman, bus driver, Low clerical: order filler, dime store, movie clerk or cashier, One-man store, repair shop

___ 6. Most clerical: (lowest white collar) secretarial occupations highly skilled tradesmen, factory foreman, (Machinist, tailor, printer, employed photographer, cabinet maker), Small store owners, pharmacists, Average salesman-Wholesale items
___ 7. Skilled professionals: (experts, technicians, accountants, photographers) retail store merchants of medium sized concerns, insurance salesmen, representatives; plant or city superintendents: ie, clerical with some supervisory capacities, executive secretaries, average midwest farmer
___ 8. Highly skilled professionals: corporation scientists, middle-management executives, company owners, low-prestige ministry, military officers, high school teachers
___ 9. Learned professions: medicine, top-flight corporation executives and military personnel, creative occupations, ministry, stockbrokers, large farm owners

27. What kind of training program, if any, would you like to have?

___ 1. NA
___ 2. None or don't care
___ 3. Unskilled work: janitor, garbage disposal, Unskilled labor: construction, railroad labor, miners, Domestics, babysitters (full-time), farm labor, Unemployed or Disabled
___ 4. Semi-skilled manual labors: assembly-line work, City service with some stigma (maintenance, meter reader), truck, taxidrivers, chauffer, waiter, waitresses
___ 5. Any skilled workman: mechanic, repairman, cook, painter, plumber, City service: policeman, fireman, milkman, mailman, bus driver, Low clerical: order filler, dime store, movie clerk or cashier, One-man store, repair shop
___ 6. Most clerical: (lowest white collar) secretarial occupations highly skilled tradesmen, factory foreman, (Machinist, tailor, printer, employed photographer, cabinet maker), Small store owners, pharmacists, Average salesman-Wholesale items
___ 7. Skilled professionals: (experts, technicians, accountants, photographers) retail store merchants of medium sized concerns, insurance salesmen, representatives; plant or city superintendents: ie, clerical with some supervisory capacities, executive secretaries, average midwest farmer
___ 8. Highly skilled professionals: corporation scientists, middle-management executives, company owners, low-prestige ministry, military officers, high school teachers
___ 9. Learned professions: medicine, top-flight corporation executives and military personnel, creative occupations, ministry, stockbrokers, large farm owners

28. Your approximate annual income

___ 1. NA
___ 2. 0 - 999
___ 3. 1000 - 1999
___ 4. 2000 - 2999
___ 5. 3000 - 3999
___ 6. 4000 - 4999
___ 7. 5000 - 5999
___ 8. 6000 - 6999
___ 9. 7000 and above

29. Time last voted in reservation election

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Within past year
___ 3. Within "past 2 or 3 years"
___ 4. "Sometime" up to 5 years ago
___ 5. "Sometime" in the more distant or indefinite past
___ 6. Never (or apparently never)

30. Descent (ancestry) traced to:

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Americans of European ancestry other than Spanish (White; includes Jewish)
___ 3. Americans of African ancestry (Negro)
___ 4. Americans of Indian ancestry (Indian)
___ 5. Americans of Spanish or Mexican ancestry (Spanish American)
___ 6. Americans of Oriental ancestry

---

31. Tribal affiliation

___ 1. NA or unknown
___ 2. Chippewa (Ojibwa)
___ 3. Sioux (Dakota)
___ 4. Winnebago
___ 5. Menominee
___ 6. Other (Interviewer: write here) _____

32. Reservation of Birth (INTERVIEWER: ASK STATE IF NOT 1 - 7)

___ 1. White Earth
___ 2. Mille Lacs
___ 3. Fond du Lacs
___ 4. Red Lake
___ 5. Leech Lake
___ 6. Nett Lake
___ 7. Grand Portage
___ 8. Wisconsin and Dakotas
___ 9. Other _____

33. Reservation lived on for the longest recent time

___ 1. White Earth
___ 2. Mille Lacs
___ 3. Fond du Lac
___ 4. Red Lake
___ 5. Leech Lake
___ 6. Nett Lake
___ 7. Grand Portage
___ 8. Wisconsin and Dakotas
___ 9. Other _____

34. Indian blood

___ 1. NA or unknown
___ 2. Less than 1/4
___ 3. 1/4 - 1/2
___ 4. 1/2 - 3/4
___ 5. 3/4 - full

35. Harvesting wild rice been a useful source of income recently

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Yes
___ 3. No

36. Number of trips made to Duluth during the past year

___ 1. NA
___ 2. None
___ 3. One
___ 4. Two
___ 5. Several
___ 6. Many

37. Number of trips to the Twin Cities made during the past year

___ 1. NA
___ 2. None
___ 3. One
___ 4. Two
___ 5. Several
___ 6. Many

38. Why have stayed on the reservation

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Don't know; can't say
___ 3. Employment purposes (includes better income)
___ 4. "Relatives" here
___ 5. "Friends" here
___ 6. Both "friends" and "relatives" here
___ 7. Because this is "home"
___ 8. Other reason(s). (INTERVIEWER: specify here _____

_____

_____

_____

39. Why made trips to Duluth or Twin Cities

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Don't know; can't say
___ 3. Employment purposes (includes better income)
(INTERVIEWER: specify source of income here _____

_____

_____)

___ 4. "Relatives" there
___ 5. "Friends" there
___ 6. Both "friends" and "relatives" there
___ 7. Because of a family event (marriage, sickness, death, burial, etc.)
___ 8. Because of harvesting wild rice or hunting and fishing
___ 9. Other reason(s). (INTERVIEWER: specify here _____

_____

_____

_____)

40. Should Leech Lake Reservation continue to exist?

___ 1. NA
___ 2. Don't know
___ 3. Yes
___ 4. No
___ 5. For a while

Reasons: _____

_____

_____

The purpose of this form is to measure your real impressions of Indian adults and young persons living in In responding, please make your judgements on the basis of what, in general, these persons seem like to you.

First, a very few questions about you.

Are you

____ 2. Male

____ 3. Female

Your marriage status

____ 2. Single

____ 3. Married

____ 4. Separated

____ 5. Divorced

____ 6. Widowed

Your position where you work

____ 2. Volunteer

____ 3. Paid aide or pre-professional

____ 4. Clerical (clerk-typist, secretary, etc.)

____ 5. Administrative (above secretary but below manager)

____ 6. Manager or professional usually operating in the office

____ 7. Manager or professional usually operating out in the community

____ 8. At the top or very near the top position in the organization

The organization where you work or its function

_____

Now, here is how you use the form:

If you feel that most Twin Cities Indians are very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

big X :___:___:___:___:___:___: small OR

big ___:___:___:___:___:___:X : small

If you feel that most Twin Cities Indians are quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

big ___:X :___:___:___:___:___: small OR

big ___:___:___:___:___:X :___: small

If most Twin Cities Indians seem only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

big ___:___:X :___:___:___:___: small OR

big ___:___:___:___:X :___:___: small

If you consider most Twin Cities Indians to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with them, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to most Twin Cities Indian adults, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

big ___:___:___:X :___:___:___: small

IMPORTANT:

1. Please be sure you check every scale for every thing - do not omit any.
2. Please put only one check-mark on a single line.
3. Make each a separate and independent judgement for each line.

THE CITIES INDIAN ADULTS

active	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	passive
intelligent	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	stupid
modern	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	traditionalistic
impolite	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	polite
likeable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unlikeable
courteous	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	rude
kind	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	cruel
emotional	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	rational
interested	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	bored
messy	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	neat
dishonest	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	honest
lazy	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	hard working
wise	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unwise
happy	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	sad
reliable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unreliable
cowardly	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	brave
dependable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	undependable
peace-loving	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	belligerent
talkative	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	quiet
sociable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unsociable
trustworthy	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	untrustworthy
religious	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	irreligious
sincere	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	insincere
unambitious	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	ambitious
friendly	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unfriendly
knowledgeable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	ignorant

THE CITIES INDIANA YOU LIVE IN

trustworthy	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	untrustworthy
neat	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	messy
reliable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unreliable
happy	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	sad
interested	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	bored
honest	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	dishonest
active	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	passive
hard working	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	lazy
stupid	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	intelligent
religious	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	irreligious
traditionalistic	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	modern
ambitious	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unambitious
emotional	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	rational
wise	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unwise
unfriendly	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	friendly
sincere	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	insincere
kind	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	cruel
polite	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	impolite
cowardly	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	brave
dependable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	undependable
sociable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unsociable
rude	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	courteous
likeable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	unlikeable
knowledgeable	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	ignorant
peace-loving	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	belligerent
talkative	___:___:___:___:___:___:___:	quiet

TCCP - AMH - UAIS - Q4

This questionnaire is intended to be used by members of the Leauge of Women Voters of Minneapolis who have volunteered to interview personnel of public and private agencies in serving the American Indians in Minneapolis.

1. Name of Agency (or General Description)_____

_____

2. Your position within the agency _____

_____

3. Are you yourself Indian? _____

4. About how many persons do you work with in an average day?_____

Of these, about how many are American Indians?_____
(If this is too difficult to estimate, get a percentage estimate for the week.)_____

5. Why do Indians come to you for services?_____

_____

What problems do they seem to have?_____

_____

How do you deal with these problems?_____

_____

Generally speaking, do the Indians you see have any special problems different from the problems of the non-Indians you see?_____

_____

_____

6. If an Indian is new to the city, what problems of adjustment do you think he faces?_____

_____

_____

_____

Are you, in your work, prepared to help him with this adjustment?_____

What difficulties do you personally have in this? Why?_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Do you encourage Indians to return to reservations for services or to live?_____ How often?_____

Why?_____

8. How long have you worked with Indians?_____

Have you taken any special training to help you understand Indian people?_____ Please specify_____

_____

9. Do you feel you are as successful in your dealings with Indians as with non-Indians?_____

_____

10. What laws or regulations relating to your work or services are a handicap to you in serving American Indians in the best possible way?

_____

_____

_____

11. Would you say the Indian population in this state does or does not have serious problems?_____

If yes, what kind of problems are there?

Poor housing, sanitation problems, health problems_____

Lack job opportunities, unfair job market_____

Lack proper education_____

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. Wisconsin State Employment Service. Employability Factors and Needs of Wisconsin Tribal Indians. Madison, Wisconsin. (no date). 40 pp.

2. League of Women Voters of Minneapolis and Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota. Indians in Minneapolis. Minneapolis, Minnesota: April, 1968. 112 pp.

3. Harkins, Arthur M. and Richard G. Woods. Indian Americans in Chicago. (Report to the St. Augustine Indian Center of Chicago on analysis of data obtained from files on Indian persons contacted by the Center in 1967.) May, 1968. Mimeographed (forthcoming).

4. Price, John A. (Ed.) American Indians in Los Angeles: A Study of Adaptation to a City. University of California, Los Angeles: Revised Edition, January, 1967. 16 pp.

5. Richard G. Woods and Arthur M. Harkins. Agency Personnel Attitudes Toward Indian Americans in Minneapolis. May, 1968. Mimeographed (forthcoming).